

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner White is thanked for courtesies extended during a telephone interview today, the substance of which is incorporated into the following remarks. Claims 24, 25 and 27 are pending herein. Claims 13-23 and 26 have been cancelled hereby. It is noted with appreciation that Examiner White has indicated during the interview that claims 24 and 27 are allowable.

Claim 25 was objected to based on an informality, on the grounds that it depends from a claim directed to a non-elected invention. Claim 25 has been amended to depend from elected claim 24. The amendment to claim 25 merely complies with a requirement as to form, by narrowing its dependency from "any one of claims 13-24" to "claim 24." A dependent claim includes all of the features of the independent claim from which it depends. It is axiomatic that once an independent claim is allowable, all claims which depend therefrom should also be allowable. Because claim 24 has been indicated to be allowable, claim 25 which includes all of the features of claim 24 by virtue of its dependency from claim 24, should also be allowable. Claim 25 was already examined. Accordingly, because claim 25 has been amended as to form and should be allowable, amendment is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 and should be entered. The amendment to claim 24 and addition of claim 26 also satisfy 37 CFR §1.116 as these claims are allowable.

The rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) on the grounds of anticipation over Noevir (JP Patent No. 10182332) has been overcome. Noevir does not disclose the functional chitosan derivative having the photo-reactive functional group of claim 24. It is appreciated that claim 24 has been indicated to be allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is appropriate. Claim 25 depends from claim 24 and thus, is patentable for the same reasons as claim 24. It is submitted that withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is appropriate.

The rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) on the grounds of anticipation over

EP 0 1 811 812 (1997-05-07), the disclosure of which does not disclose the

appreciated that claim 24 has been indicated to be allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is appropriate. Claim 25 is also patentable for the same reasons as claim 24. It is submitted that withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is appropriate.

Claim 27 depends from allowable claim 24. It is appreciated that claim 27 has been indicated to be allowable. The applied references do not disclose the combined features of this claim.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments and foregoing remarks place all pending claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly an early Notice of Allowance for this application is respectfully solicited.

Dated: October 16, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Paul A. Serbinowski
Reg No. 34,429

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
Ohio Savings Building
12th Floor
1801 East 9th Street
Cleveland, OH 44114
Telephone: (216) 579-1700
Facsimile: (216) 579-6073
E-mail: ip@pearnegordon.com